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Abstract

The Michigan Organization on Adolescent Sexual Health (MOASH) identified a gap in available research on sexual violence norms specific to youth in Michigan. In response, the team adapted the Michigan Public Health Institute (MPHI)’s 2019 Michigan Sexual Violence Prevention Survey into a youth-facing survey using RedCap. The Youth Sexual Violence Social Norms Survey was divided into two main sections: 1) a series of demographic questions and 2) a questionnaire divided into 9 topics that asked respondents to use a Likert scale to agree or disagree with statements about sexual violence. The survey was shared online by MOASH and its network in January and May 2021. It captured data from 493 youth throughout Michigan between the ages of 13-19. The survey found that 70% of youth knew someone who was sexually assaulted and 70% knew someone who experienced abuse. Gender and sexual identity significantly contributed to how youth understood sexual violence, especially with practicing consent digitally. Given these findings, MOASH’s team asserts that continued prevention education efforts in grades K-12 needed to create norms that keep young people safe in Michigan.
About the Survey

The Story

The Michigan Organization on Adolescent Sexual Health (MOASH) is a 501c3 non-partisan organization that was founded in 2008 by statewide leaders and advocates of adolescent sexual health. Today, MOASH mobilizes youth voices, engages community partners, and informs decision-makers to advance sexual health, identities, and rights in the state. MOASH is committed to centering youth voices, and all projects are youth-informed from start to finish.

The survey was inspired by the Michigan Public Health Institute (MPHI) 2019 Michigan Sexual Violence Prevention Survey. The data collected is meant to be used to prevent sexual assault, abuse, and harassment in Michigan. It can also be used to improve resources for community-based prevention programs. However, this data was only collected from adults. The Sexual Violence Prevention Team, coordinated by MOASH as part of the MDHHS and CDC funded program, needed data on sexual violence norms specific to youth in Michigan. It felt crucial for their work, and the work of their partners, to collect it. In 2020, the team adapted the MPHI survey into a version that could be applicable to youth.

This survey was shared online with youth between the ages 13-19 in January and May 2021 via social media and the team’s networks. Special attention was paid to the differences between youth who identify as cisgender boys and youth who are not cisgender boys, queer youth and non-queer youth, and white youth and youth of color. It was developed over a series of meetings and created using RedCap. SPSS was used for data analysis.

MY GAB, Michigan Youth Girls and Non-Binary Advisory Board, worked closely with MOASH’s Sexual Violence Prevention Team on this project. MY GAB is a youth advisory council that focuses on empowering girls and nonbinary youth, and changing the culture of consent in Michigan schools. This group is composed of youth across the state and were key players in sharing the survey widely.

Prioritizing youth voices is not only the mission of MOASH; it is necessary for understanding how to best support and protect young people. MPHI’s data confirmed that “...communities that are closely connected are more likely to hold people who sexually assault, abuse, or harass others accountable.” Participants of this survey found a lack of connectedness and community in Michigan with just less than 50% of respondents stating that their neighborhood is ‘close knit.’ This is further evidence for the need to build community with young people and provide built-in community support across violence prevention measures.

MOASH is committed to giving youth access to the tools and information needed to recognize their own agency and make choices best for them with respect to their sexual health, relationships, and personal development. We hope that this survey can be one of those tools.
The Survey Topics

To understand norms among youth in Michigan, we asked about:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Connectedness</th>
<th>Family Connectedness</th>
<th>Neighborhood Connectedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How youth feel about being part of their school community</td>
<td>How youth feel about people they consider their family</td>
<td>How youth feel about their neighborhood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hostile Sexism</th>
<th>Consent Norms</th>
<th>Rape Myth Acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How youth understand sexist behaviors and opinions</td>
<td>How youth understand and practice consent</td>
<td>How youth understand and are impacted by rape culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support for Survivors</th>
<th>Bystander Behavior</th>
<th>Digital Consent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How youth believe those around them would react to sexual assault</td>
<td>How youth believe they would react to abuse and assault</td>
<td>How youth understand and practice consent in digital spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Scale

Surveyed youth responded to each statement using a Likert scale.

The Likert scale is used to measure the level of agreement with a given statement. It is commonly used in survey research to understand the survey takers’ thoughts and beliefs. In our project, each point on the Likert scale had a corresponding score:

0 - strongly disagree
1 - disagree
2 - agree
3 - strongly agree

An average answer was calculated for each question, as well as an overall score for the survey topic.

With consent in mind, surveyed youth were also given the option “prefer not to answer.” This was not included in the averaged scores.
Survey Demographics

493 Total Participants

Gender Identity

- 93% of survey participants identified as cisgender
  - Cisgender = 459
  - Transgender+ = 34

- 53% of survey participants identified as boys
  - Boys = 266
  - Not Boys = 227

Racial Identity

- 77% of survey participants identified as white
  - White = 380
  - People of Color = 113

Sexual Orientation

- 75% of survey participants identified as straight
  - Straight = 372
  - LGBQ+ = 121

Age

- 25% of survey participants were 15 years old
  - Age 13 = 12 participants
  - Age 14 = 65 participants
  - Age 15 = 123 participants
  - Age 16 = 119 participants
  - Age 17 = 102 participants
  - Age 18 = 64 participants
  - Age 19 = 8 participants

Residence

- 27% of survey participants lived in Kent county
  - See page 6
Alpena = 31
Kent = 135
Macomb = 19
Midland = 18
Oakland = 21
Washtenaw = 25
Wayne = 29
How to Read the Data

The Format

The diagram below maps key information about the topic on each data page.

Survey questions pertaining to the topic area answered on a Likert scale

The above questions averaged into an overall score in the last row

Gender

Overall average score broken down according to identity groups

Highlights, observations, and takeaways from the section about the topic

Students disagreed that people at their schools generally got along with each other.

Overall average score broken down according to identity groups

Straight youth had higher scores than LGBTQ+ youth for overall connectedness to their school.
The data collected with this survey was analyzed using statistical testing. Statistical testing is used to find out if the differences in the data are due to something other than chance or coincidence. If a relationship is found after running a series of calculations, this means there is statistical significance.

If something is statistically significant, the differences in the data can likely be connected and used to make meaningful observations about what is being researched. Finding statistical significance is especially helpful when comparing experiences of people who have different identities. Statistically significant findings are noted in the highlights portion of each data page.

At MOASH we are committed to grounding our work in equity, inclusion, diversity, and justice within all aspects of our organization and within the field of adolescent sexual health. Our team prioritized collecting data to understand the difference in beliefs and experiences between white youth and youth of color. Much to our surprise, there was no statistical significance found in comparing answers according to racial identity amongst surveyed youth. Because of this, we focused primarily on reporting statistically significant findings related to gender and sexuality. We would like to remind readers of this report that racial identity significantly shapes experiences and belief systems, and is an important consideration in research of any kind.
Prevalence Rates

Prevalence is how common an experience is.

Sexual assault is any sexual contact without consent.

70% of surveyed students know someone who has experienced sexual assault.

Abuse is when someone causes repeated harm.

71% of surveyed students know someone who has experienced abuse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Not boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBQ+</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Not boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBQ+</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: This is the only data page that uses percentages to express the survey results.
School Connectedness

Survey respondents who were enrolled at the time of the survey were asked how connected they feel to their school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Average Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People at my school are willing to help each other.</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a close-knit school.</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in my school can be trusted.</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in my school generally get along with each other.</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in my school do not share the same values.</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe my school is trying hard to make sure that all people are treated fairly.</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe my school is trying hard to make sure that all members are safe.</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Average Level of School Connectedness 1.91

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Average Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not boys</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sexual Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Average Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ+</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students disagreed that people at their schools generally got along with each other.

Boys had significantly higher scores than non-boys for overall connectedness to their school.

Straight youth had higher scores than LGBTQ+ youth for overall connectedness to their school.
Family Connectedness

Survey respondents were asked how connected they feel to their families. We did not define “family” in the survey.

Students surveyed generally agreed that they feel they are connected to their families.

Boys had higher scores than non-boys for overall connectedness to their families.

Straight youth had significantly higher scores than LGBTQ+ youth for overall connectedness to their families.

Overall Average Level of Family Connectedness

Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Not boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sexual Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Straight</th>
<th>LGBTQ+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Answer

0 = Strongly disagree  3 = Strongly agree

- People in my family are willing to help each other: 2.44
- My family is close-knit: 2.34
- People in my family can be trusted: 2.31
- People in my family generally don’t get along with each other: 1.86
- People in my family do not share the same values: 1.26
- I believe my family is trying hard to make sure that all people are treated fairly: 2.28
- I believe my family is trying hard to make sure that all members are safe: 2.35

Overall Average Level of Family Connectedness: 2.11
Neighborhood Connectedness

Survey respondents were asked how connected they feel to their neighborhoods. We defined neighborhood as the people and area around where you primarily live.

- People around here are willing to help their neighbors. Average Answer: 2.20
- This is a close-knit neighborhood. Average Answer: 2.12
- People in my neighborhood can be trusted. Average Answer: 2.01
- People in my neighborhood generally don’t get along with each other. Average Answer: 1.30
- People in my neighborhood do not share the same values. Average Answer: 1.97
- I believe my neighborhood is trying hard to make sure that all people are treated fairly. Average Answer: 2.03
- I believe my neighborhood is trying hard to make sure that all members are safe. Average Answer: 2.20

Overall Average Level of Neighborhood Connectedness: 1.93

**Gender**
- Boys: 2.03
- Not boys: 1.80

**Sexual Orientation**
- Straight: 1.97
- LGBTQ+: 1.79

Students surveyed believed that their neighborhood treated all people fairly and kept safe.

Boys had significantly higher scores than non-boys for overall connectedness to their neighborhood.

Straight youth had significantly higher scores than LGBTQ+ youth for overall connectedness to their neighborhood.
Hostile Sexism

Survey respondents were asked how strongly they agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how women/girls and men/boys act and how they interact with each other.

- Feminists are making unreasonable demands of men.
- There are many women who like to sexually tease men and then friendzone them.
- Women are too easily offended.
- Most women fail to appreciate what men do for them.
- Most women interpret innocent jokes as being sexist.
- Women exaggerate problems they have in relationships.
- All women do is boss around men.

**Overall Average Level of Hostile Sexism Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Average Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feminists are making unreasonable demands of men.</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many women who like to sexually tease men and then friendzone them.</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are too easily offended.</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most women fail to appreciate what men do for them.</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most women interpret innocent jokes as being sexist.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women exaggerate problems they have in relationships.</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All women do is boss around men.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Average Level of Hostile Sexism Agreement</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.08</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Average Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not boys</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sexual Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Average Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ+</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students generally did not agree with statements containing hostile sexism.

Straight youth had significantly higher scores than LGBTQ+ youth for agreement with statements containing hostile sexism.
Consent Norms

Survey respondents were asked how they feel about sexual encounters and sexual consent between two individuals. We defined "consent" as the clear, freely-given agreement to engage in a specific sexual activity.

In a relationship, it is important for the people involved to talk about what they are comfortable with and respect each other's boundaries.

I would stop sexual activity when asked to, even if I were already aroused or "turned on." 2.33

It is important to get consent before touching a long-term partner sexually. 2.45

It is important to get consent before touching someone. 2.41

I think someone should stop the first time the other person says no to sexual activity. 2.38

In a relationship, it is important for the people involved to talk about what they are comfortable with and respect each other's boundaries. 2.44

Overall Average Level of Normalized Consent 2.40

Students surveyed generally agreed with statements about practicing consent during a sexual encounter.

Boys had lower scores than non-boys for overall level of normalized consent.

Straight youth had significantly lower scores than LGBQ+ youth for overall level of normalized consent.
Rape Myth Acceptance

The term “rape” refers to a specific kind of sexual assault, and is defined as sexual penetration of another person’s body without that person’s consent. “Rape myths” are cultural beliefs about rape that sustain and allow sexual violence. Survey respondents were asked how strongly they agree or disagree with each of the following statements containing or describing rape myths.

- If both people are drunk, it can’t be rape.
- If a person doesn’t report being raped right away, they are probably lying.
- If a girl initiates kissing or any kind of sexual activity, she should not be surprised if a boy assumes she wants to have sex.
- Boys don’t purposely force girls to have sex, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.
- If a girl acts like a slut or wears slutty clothes, she’s asking for it.
- Rape accusations are often used as a way to punish boys.
- It shouldn’t be considered rape if a boy is drunk and didn’t realize what he was doing.
- A lot of times, girls who say they were raped agreed to have sex and then regret it.
- If someone doesn’t physically resist sex, it shouldn’t be considered rape.
- When someone gets raped, it’s often because the way they said “no” was unclear.
- Rape in same-sex relationships rarely happens.
- A boy who claims to be raped is usually making a big deal out of nothing.
- It’s not a big deal for boys to date older women.

(0=low acceptance, 3= high acceptance)
## Overall Average Level of Acceptance of Rape Myths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not boys</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>LGBQ+</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students surveyed generally disagreed with statements that contained common myths about experiencing rape.

Boys surveyed accepted rape myths significantly more than non-boys.

Straight youth surveyed accepted rape myths significantly more than LGBQ+ youth.
Support for Survivors

At School

Survey respondents were asked, if someone were to report a sexual assault at their school, whether or not they think the following statements would occur. The more likely the event, the higher the perceived level of support for survivors at school.

![Bar chart showing support levels for survivors at school](image)

- **The majority of students would support the person making the report.**
  - Average Answer: 2.23

- **The majority of teachers would take the report seriously.**
  - Average Answer: 2.26

- **School administration (principal & VP) would take the report seriously.**
  - Average Answer: 2.31

- **Administration would take action against the offender(s).**
  - Average Answer: 2.18

**Overall Average Level of Support at School**

- Average Answer: 2.24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Average Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not boys</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Average Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ+</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Students generally assumed that a survivor reporting an assault at school would be supported.
- Boys assumed a significantly higher level of support for survivors at school than non-boys.
- Straight youth assumed a significantly higher level of support for survivors at school than LGBTQ+ youth.
Support for Survivors

With Peers

Survey respondents were asked, if they were sexual assaulted and told their friends, whether or not they think the following statements would occur. The more likely the event, the lower the perceived level of support for survivors amongst their peers.

1. Tell you that you were irresponsible or not cautious enough.
2. Treat you differently than before you told them in a way you didn’t like.
3. Tell you that you could have done more to prevent the assault from occurring.
4. Avoid talking to you or spending time with you.

**Overall Average Level of Support with Peers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Average Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell you that you were irresponsible or not cautious enough.</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat you differently than before you told them in a way you didn’t like.</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell you that you could have done more to prevent the assault from occurring.</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid talking to you or spending time with you.</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Average Level of Support with Peers</strong></td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Average Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not boys</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sexual Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Average Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ+</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students surveyed generally assumed that they would not receive support from their peers.

Boys assumed a significantly lower level of support amongst their peers if they were assaulted than non-boys.

Straight youth assumed a significantly lower level of support amongst their peers than LGBTQ+ youth.
Bystander Behavior

Intervention

Surveyed youth were asked if they agreed with the following statements suggesting how they might act if they saw or suspected sexual assault or abuse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Average Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would speak up against a friend making sexist jokes or comments.</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I saw a friend taking a very drunk person up to their room, I would ask what the friend was doing.</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would express disagreement with a friend who said having sex with someone when both people are drunk is okay.</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I heard a friend yelling at their partner I would say something to them.</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I heard a friend talking about forcing or convincing someone to have sex with them, I would speak up against it and express concern for the person who was forced.</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would do something if I saw a girl surrounded by a group of boys at a party who looks very uncomfortable.</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Average Level of Willingness to Intervene: 2.20

**Gender**
- Boys: 2.16
- Not Boys: 2.25

**Sexual Orientation**
- Straight: 2.15
- LGBTQ+: 2.37

Students surveyed generally indicated that they would intervene if they witnessed a potential assault situation.

Non-Boys indicated they would be more likely to intervene if they witnessed a potential assault situation.

Straight youth were significantly less likely to intervene if they witnessed a potential assault situation.
Surveyed youth were asked how likely they are to engage in these behaviors.

**Support a friend who was sexually assaulted.**
- 2.47

**Ask someone I know who seems upset if they are okay or need help.**
- 2.32

**Express concern or offer to help if someone I know said they had an unwanted sexual experience but didn’t call it sexual assault.**
- 2.33

**Share information or resources about sexual assault with someone I don’t know.**
- 1.90

**Let someone know I am available for support if I believe they may have been assaulted.**
- 2.28

**Approach a friend if I thought they were in an abusive relationship and let them know that I was there to help.**
- 2.31

**Overall Average Level of Positive Reaction**
- 2.27

---

**Gender**
- Boys: 2.21
- Not boys: 2.34

**Sexual Orientation**
- Straight: 2.21
- LGBTQ+: 2.43

---

Students surveyed generally indicated that they would react in a positive way towards someone who is being abused.

Boys had lower scores than non-boys for overall level of likelihood of reacting to sexual assault.

LGBQ+ youth had significantly higher likelihood of reacting to sexual assault and other abusive behavior.
Digital Consent

Digital abuse is the use of technologies such as texting and social networking to bully, harass, stalk or intimidate a partner. To avoid this, digital consent is crucial. Surveyed youth were asked if they agreed with the following statements about digital consent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Average Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s okay to share an ex’s nude photo with someone else without their permission.</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s okay for my partner to want my phone and social media passwords.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s okay for someone’s partner to convince them to send nudes photos.</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s fine to send nude pictures to someone without asking.</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s okay if my partner wants me to share my location at all times.</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s okay if a partner gets jealous about who’s following me on social media.</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Average Level of Digital Consent: 1.35

Gender:
- Boys: 1.73
- Not boys: 0.09

Sexual Orientation:
- Straight: 1.52
- LGBTQ+: 0.82

Students surveyed generally agreed with statements about practicing digital consent.

Boys had a significantly lower understanding of digital consent than non-boys.

LGBTQ+ youth had a significantly higher understanding of digital consent than straight youth.
Survey Limitations

Limitations are elements of the project design or circumstances that could have impacted the findings. Identifying limitations gives context to research, acknowledges problems, and shows where more work is needed.

**Geographic Location**
MOASH successfully reached many counties in Michigan, but not all. Additionally, some counties were over-represented in the sample, such as southwestern Kent County.

**Transgender+ Representation**
MOASH was able to reach a significantly more cisgender youth compared to transgender+ youth.

**Language Accessibility**
MOASH developed the survey in English and did not translate it into other languages for dissemination. This limited the collection of data to youth who could read this language.

**Ability**
MOASH did not ask about the ability of surveyed youth. Though some of the youth likely identify as disabled, we did not collect that information specifically and are unable to compare the norms of those with and without this identity.
Conclusions

The purpose of this survey was to understand how youth in Michigan create, understand, and accept sexual violence norms. Each data page highlights key observations made according to a specific component of these belief systems. Considering that information, our team has made the following conclusions:

Gender identity contributed to how youth understood consent, their connections to people around them, and support available to them. For example: Youth who identified as boys had a less advanced understanding of consent, often having beliefs that perpetuated harm and cultural myths about sexual violence. Boys also did not believe that they would be supported by their peers if they disclosed that they were assaulted.

Sexual identity contributed to how youth understood consent, their connections to people around them, and support available to them. This was especially true for youth who identified as LGBQ+. These students did not feel as connected to or supported by their schools, families, and neighborhoods as straight youth, but LGBQ+ youth had advanced knowledge of practicing consent. They were able to differentiate examples of healthy and unhealthy consent more frequently.

The topic with the most significant differences between boys and non boys as well as straight and LGBQ+ youth was digital consent. Students who identified as boys and/or as straight were in more agreement with statements that were not examples of healthy digital consent. This highlights a greater need for relevant, updated information about consent that is applicable to the interactions student have digitally via mobile apps, websites, or texting.

This survey found that a majority of surveyed youth had an awareness of sexual violence in their community, whether it be something they experienced or only heard about. This high prevalence of abuse and sexual assault highlights the need for sexual violence prevention education in grades K–12, specifically around consent. The school environment is an ideal space for youth to learn about consent and create norms that keep young people safe.
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Resources

Teaching Consent

MOASH Consent Toolkit
https://www.moash.org/_files/ugd/0a340a_b3eac850fa2f41edb49844ef400e57fe.pdf

Support for Survivors

Michigan SA/DV Provider Directory
https://mcedsv.org/provider-directory/

Michigan’s Sexual Assault Hotline
https://www.michigan.gov/voices4
Confidential sexual assault hotline: 855-VOICES4
Confidential sexual assault text line: 866-238-1454

Love Is Respect
www.loveisrespect.org
Hotline: 866-331-9474
TTY: 866-331-8453
Text LOVEIS to 866-331-9474

Michigan Mental Health Warmline (10am-2am)
888-PEER-753 (888-733-7753)

Trevor Project
24-hr Trevor Project - 866-488-7386
24-hr Trans Lifeline - 877-565-8860

Information about Sexual Violence

Know Your XI (Know Your Nine)
https://www.knowyourix.org/

Stop Sexual Assault in Schools
https://stopsexualassaultinschools.org/